

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

January 21, 2014 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

*Approved at the February 25, 2014 meeting*

Present:

**Members:**

Janet Langdell, Chairperson

Paul Amato

Kathy Bauer

Steve Duncanson

Judy Plant

Tom Sloan

Susan Robinson, Alternate member

**Staff:**

Jodie Levandowski, Town Planner

Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary

David Vosquet, Videographer

**Excused:**

Chris Beer

**PRESENTATION:**

1. **Pennichuck Corporation;** Watershed restoration efforts and discussion on NPDES MS4 goals.

**MINUTES:**

2. Approval of minutes from the 12/17/13 and 1/7/14 meetings.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

3. **St. Joseph Hospital et.al./ Milford Medical Center – Nashua St – Map 31, Lots 32 & 32-1 and Map 32, Lot 1; Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct a new medical facility with associated site improvements** and; respective waiver requests from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, Section 6.05.0; *Nashua and Elm Street Corridor District*, in accordance with the Milford Development Regulations, Section 5.020.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

4. **Carol Colburn – Osgood Rd & Woodhawk Dr – Map 51, Lot 1;** Major open space subdivision creating twenty-seven (27) new residential lots.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

Chairperson Langdell called the meeting to order at 6:30PM. She then explained the ground rules for the public hearing, introduced the Board and Staff, and read the agenda into the record.

**PRESENTATION:**

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Rebecca Balke, Comprehensive Environmental Inc,  
Don Ware, Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.

R. Balke said they are meeting with each of the five watershed communities and gave an informative presentation on the Pennichuck watershed restoration efforts and the NPDES MS4 permit program that included the following topics. (PowerPoint attached to final copy of minutes)

- Watershed protection and background,
- Water Balance
- Watershed restoration goals and summary of past efforts
- 2012 Watershed restoration plan
  - Goals,
  - Public education,
  - Regulations,
  - Private Property BMP's
- Restoration approach
  - School education
  - Adoption of NH AoT requirements
  - Restoration & stormwater permit common goals
  - Ways to coordinate and piggy back with other communities
  - Roof leader disconnection program, which focused on the more urbanized areas within the watershed; Amherst, Merrimack and Nashua
- Stormwater Permit requirements
  - Ordinances
  - Design criteria
  - Groundwater recharge and infiltration
  - Annual report
- AoT requirements
- Impervious area disconnection
  - \*\* The slide on pg. 10 should read: *Meets stormwater permit – more recharge, “decreased” DCIA.*
- Outreach tools
  - New Hampshire Homeowner's Guide to Stormwater Management (DIY manual)
  - Soak up the Rain NH
  - Pennichuck Website:  
[www.pennichuck.com/](http://www.pennichuck.com/) or [http://www.pennichuck.com/watershed\\_interactive\\_map.php](http://www.pennichuck.com/watershed_interactive_map.php)
  - NH DES Loading Model:  
<http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/stormwater/documents/nhres-loading-model-instruct.pdf>

R. Balke said in summary, we're just trying to get our two programs to correlate. You have to do education and we want to do education so there are areas where we could definitely work together. We are really trying to focus on and target education because if you can get to the kids, they will take it home to their parents. We are also looking at other opportunities by working with some big box stores that distribute fertilizers. J. Langdell mentioned that the Town involved the schools when we created the MS4 regulations and that outreach program was very successful. R. Balke delivered copies of the 2008 Stormwater manuals to Staff.

R. Balke noted that Pennichuck has already put some BMP's in place. Also, if the AoT design criteria are adopted as Stormwater requirements, then you'd meet everything presented today, provide maximum watershed protection and comply with the new Stormwater Permit requirements. AoT regulations only apply to disturbance greater than one acre which is why we'd like to see these requirements adopted at the lower threshold. It would tie everything all together and be helpful for water quality in general.

J. Langdell asked how the Pennichuck Watershed Plan interfaced with the other watershed plans that we have; because Souhegan River, Lower Merrimack River and Pennichuck all overlap to some degree. R. Balke said there hasn't been any; each plan is focused on the specific water supply. There is overlap between the communities because you will have to monitor bacteria as a result of the Merrimack River. This is the first step; we wanted to start with the towns. J. Langdell said there will be more conversation as we move forward with the permitting process. Also, these links are very good resources and suggested adding them to a homeowner's resource page on the Town's website.

#### **MINUTES:**

J. Langdell submitted corrections for the 12/17/13 minutes. P. Amato made a motion to approve the minutes from the 12/17/13 meeting, as amended. S. Robinson seconded. S. Duncanson, K. Bauer, J. Plant and T. Sloan abstained. All else voted in favor. S. Duncanson made a motion to table the minutes from the 1/7/14 meeting. T. Sloan seconded, P. Amato abstained and all else voted in favor.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Carol Colburn – Osgood Rd & Woodhawk Dr – Map 51, Lot 1;** Major open space subdivision creating twenty-seven (27) new residential lots.

Chairperson Langdell read email correspondence from Randy Haight, Meridian Land Services Inc. dated 1/21/14.

S. Duncanson made a motion to grant a 65 day extension from RSA 674, per the applicant's request. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor. T. Sloan made a motion to table the application to the 3/18/14 meeting. J. Plant seconded and all in favor. S. Duncanson clarified that it should be tabled to the 2/18/14 meeting. K. Bauer made a motion to amend the previous motion to table the application to the 2/18/14 meeting. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

**St. Joseph Hospital et.al./Milford Medical Center – Nashua St – Map 31, Lots 32 & 32-1 & Map 32, Lot 1;** **Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct a new medical facility with associated site improvements** and; respective waiver requests from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VI, Section 6.05.0; *Nashua and Elm Street Corridor District*, in accordance with the Milford Development Regulations, Section 5.020.

*No abutters were present:*

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Kyle Burchard, Meridian Land Services, Inc.

Danielle Santos, Lavallee Brensinger Architects

Bob Demers, St Joseph's Hospital

Kathy Cowette, St Joseph's Hospital

Brad Westgate, Winer & Bennett

J. Langdell read the notice into the record and asked if the waiver request form was complete. J. Levandowski replied this form pertains to the Milford Development Regulations; we do not have a form specific to this request. P. Amato made a motion to accept the application. T. Sloan seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

K. Burchard distributed an outline dated 1/21/14, presented plans dated 12/23/13 and gave a brief history of the project.

#### **Architecture**

D. Santos said there have not been any significant changes made to the building size, shape, materials or look since the November meeting; however, we are continuing to do minor refinements to the project as we go along. The footprint of the building is pretty well set. The materials are to be similar to the existing medical office building. The street side elevation shows that the building has been broken up into several different forms to try to break down the scale and make it relate more closely to the neighboring buildings. A smaller gable on the right houses the community center and is connected internally to the main building on the left. The materials will be

semititious clapboard siding with stone at the base and architectural asphalt shingles on the roof. The largest form will be in the middle of the site and reduces as it gets closer to the neighbors and Kaley Park. The shape and location of the building are really dictated by the constraints on the site and to allow the medical center to remain operational during construction, which be done in three phases. The phasing will be: 1. demolish the barn and part of the house and construct the new drive and new parking area; 2. construct the new drive and the new medical center between the wetlands, the existing medical center and the property lines; 3. demolish the existing facility and put the parking in the front in place.

S. Robinson inquired if the design of the whole building is going to match the medical office building or just the portion where the community room will be. D. Santos replied the whole building will be similar to the medical building behind. The semititious clapboard siding a similar color, the entire perimeter of the building base will be stone and the roof will be asphalt shingles. S. Robinson said the rendering looks different compared to the design of the building in the rear which has a more elegant rural appearance and the proposed building is more similar to the building in Nashua. D. Santos said the rendering is simplified and the building in back is actually cedar shakes. We looked at that for this building but the scale is just too big to make it look architecturally correct so we decided to go with the siding instead but the color and type of material will be similar and the windows will probably be metal. P. Amato noted that this will be a full two story building at Nashua St. D. Santos said 2/3's of the building would be two stories. J. Langdell said this rendition has the building broken up by windows and it has come a long way from the first rendition we saw. D. Santos said the top of the gable, at the highest point, is set slightly below the zoning requirements for the height above the average grade at 35ft. The maximum height we can be at is 33'9" off the first floor and currently we are at 33'2".

J. Langdell inquired where the HVAC would be located on the roof. D. Santos explained the location of the HVAC equipment and said it would be screened from view from all neighbors and there would be noise protection, having a full story of building between the units and any of the neighbors on Linden St. K. Burchard further described the roof layout in detail and showed the first and second floor plans of the building.

P. Amato inquired how they would catch the roof water. K. Burchard stated that all the water exits towards the MRI loading dock area to the west. P. Amato asked what the footprint of the building would be. D. Santos replied 16,500SF. J. Langdell asked what the present building's square footage was. K. Burchard said he could find that out.

P. Amato said, from an architectural standpoint, considering all that we've talked about for many months, he'd rather see a rendering that shows what the building will actually look like. We're taking a leap of faith when we still have a computer generated drawing that still looks really square. I'm just not comfortable with you saying it's going to look like the building out back because these pictures don't look like that. D. Santos said our goal is to tie the materials together between the two buildings; they will have similar language in their materials and gable roofs. We can't transfer the architectural style of the medical office building into the larger facility, so we've tried to use glass windows in areas to showcase the program. Larger windows are located at the main entrance, the community space and at the physical therapy area. The remaining windows are a smaller size in a repetitive format to give scale to the larger building in front and break down the mass. J. Langdell asked if bringing sample materials in would help. P. Amato said he was hoping we'd be further along with this, considering all the previous meetings. I have some concerns that when they build this, people will ask how could you let this happen and I will have to say they told us it was similar to the medical office building. Everybody likes what's out back but I don't know that it will be similar to that building. We understand that you are running an urgent care center, but we are still in a residential neighborhood and I'm not convinced that this is the best look for this residential neighborhood. J. Plant said she agreed; it will stick out and people will ask how we let this happen. It just doesn't have the look of something that is going to fit the neighborhood. We have been very clear that is what we've wanted from day one. D. Santos said this detailed 3-D image makes up our construction documents. The materials in real life have more richness. Hardiplank siding is a more residential material that we wouldn't normally use on a medical facility but we are proposing it here and although the medical office building is cedar shake, the majority of the neighboring houses are clapboard which is another factor to go with clapboard. We added more residential details to fit more within the neighborhood and it has been nice to translate my residential architectural background to a more commercial building. I understand the Board's concerns, but

we do have to take a small leap. The two buildings are different and have different functions. We are trying to be cognizant of the neighborhood but also to be respectable to the context.

S. Robinson said Paul's point is important and everybody loves the building in the rear and people's hopes are that standards will be met. J. Langdell clarified that many people like the building in back. P. Amato referenced the past expansion for the ER and said it was built to look similar to the house and barn. It served its purpose and it didn't have to be modern looking with two-story atrium windows and reiterated concerns about this. It is a leap of faith that this design will look appropriate in this location. One good thing is that it will be set back from the road. J. Langdell asked if the Board had any suggestions to improve this architecturally. An impasse will not get us anywhere. S. Robinson suggested framing the windows would make it more amenable to the surrounding properties. She also stated that she is not uncomfortable with the atrium design at all.

S. Duncanson said the materials would be cement so it will look different. It is a personal preference, but he doesn't like the looks of Hardiplank. It looks like fake wood and after painting a few times, it looks like a solid surface compared to vinyl. He didn't see why the section of the building that houses the gym and the gables couldn't be the same cedar shakes as the rear building. The big area with the symbol sticks out like a sore thumb and is a focal point that makes the building look bigger than it actually is and detracts from the character of Milford.

J. Plant said the glass does that as well; it looks taller than it is. All she can see is a big box and that is totally out of sync with the rest of the neighborhood. J. Langdell described some of the houses in the neighborhood and said other than size she didn't see how it was out of character. D. Santos said she's lived here her whole life and knows what the vernacular architecture looks like. Buildings in the area have the main house which is sort of like the medical center. Then there is a connecting piece that was added on because something was needed and then another piece. That's how we looked at the development of the medical center. The main section is the focal point; the reason the building is there. There is a small connector that leads to the gable and there is an area in the back which is more functional and obscured from the street which is a less defined form. The thought was that it was sort of an organic breakdown of the shapes similar to New England architecture.

J. Levandowski read from the Nashua and Elm Street Corridor standards, Section 6.05.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, *The following standards are tools that create a flexible framework to guide the appearance of future development that is compatible with the historic nature of Milford, while allowing for innovation and architectural creativity in order to enhance a special place.* K. Bauer rebutted saying there are at least ten (10) waivers from the overlay district being requested. They are probably all necessary; however, if you put those waivers against the intent of the overlay district that is a lot. J. Langdell said the applicant has added a number of elements that are specifically addressed in the overlay district; breakdown of mass, smaller windows, no flat roofs. P. Amato said the question is whether or not with all these waivers, could they have gone a little further on the building design to make up for all of that. J. Langdell said we would get to the waivers later and not all may be needed. K. Burchard said none of the waivers affect the building, they are all site related. D. Santos said this plan meets/satisfies the overlay guidelines; the orientation, massing and form, height, pedestrian scale, small windows along the front, small railings, plantings, and lower site lighting. The architectural features are common in the district. There are probably many houses in the area with Hardiplank siding, whether or not the Board likes it. Clapboard siding and stone bases are very common in New Hampshire. The roof has been changed from the original presentation and we have added gables where they are visible from the street. The guidelines suggest that the building entrance can be denoted by large glass areas. J. Levandowski read Section 6.05.6:D.7.C Windows. D. Santos said we were trying to do two things; we focused the larger areas of activity at the entrance, the community center and the gym areas. Everywhere else, we have smaller more residential scale windows. The roughly 4' square second floor windows are scaled to the building. J. Levandowski read Section 6.05.6:D.7 Windows and clarified that the previously mentioned pedestrian scale refers to lighting elements not windows. J. Langdell brought up the windows at LaBelle Winery and said she can understand it for the community room use.

S. Duncanson said there are views from the south and the east; is there a view from the west, from the ball field and Linden St? J. Langdell requested that the applicant submit a rendering for the view from Linden St looking east. P. Amato asked if they had the ability to do a 3-D model.

Mechanicals:

K. Burchard said there haven't been any new developments with the design or connections to the building for plumbing and mechanicals. Milford Fire Department coordination has progressed and there is confirmation that the design matches with the department's needs for the alarm system. J. Langdell added that Captain Smedick's comments from interdepartmental reviews were that they are continuing to work with the engineers and so far everything has been addressed from their perspective. K. Burchard said a construction schedule has been developed and the approximate timeline will be fourteen (14) months from turning dirt to completion. D. Santos said their hope is to complete the construction documents, apply for permits and send to bid. From bid we are expecting a 13-14 month construction period for all phases. K. Burchard noted that the conceptual phasing sequence will be refined when the construction supervisor is on board.

P. Amato inquired if the west parking lot would provide enough parking for customers and staff during construction. K. Burchard said there will be a transitional period of time where both parking lots will be used and the construction manager will decide how to manage those areas; adequate parking will be maintained throughout construction. D. Santos said during construction we anticipate the site work to follow the building work and the hope is that the parking lot currently behind the medical center is somewhat online while they are building the parking to the right and then there will be a switch over. B. Demers described how the parking would be handled during the interim and through the construction process. There will be adequate parking for customers and staff. K. Burchard presented sheet SP-5 for the construction sequencing and more details for parking during the transitional period.

J. Langdell asked for an explanation for the *future Nashua St widening* referenced on sheet SP-5. K. Burchard said the Nashua St widening had been presented and discussed at previous meetings and the determination that he understood was that the Nashua St widening was to occur at some point in the future. The intent of knowing what that design would entail so that it would not disrupt the improvements to St Joseph's in this site plan has come from internal discussions. J. Langdell read from the 11/19/13 Planning Board minutes *.....the final phase of construction will open and occupy the new building, demolish the old building and complete the remainder of the site work for the MRI pad, Nashua St access and the widening of Nashua St ....* and the 12/23/13 BOS minutes where it was said *.....Chairman Daniels asked about turning lanes and widening of the road and if that will be part of St. Joes site work. Mr. Demers said yes.....* K. Burchard said that was in reference to the access road. K. Bauer said Chairman Daniels was referring to the plans in the packet which explained the widening of Nashua St. The DPW director has some serious concerns with this project not including the widening of Nashua St. P. Amato asked why the applicant would not want to widen Nashua St while you are doing the site work. K. Burchard said the understanding is that the use is not being intensified and therefor the traffic will not increase. P. Amato asked if the applicant thought it wasn't St Joseph's responsibility to do the off-site improvements. K. Burchard replied that is what he is suggesting but it is the Board's authority to make that determination as to what is required. J. Langdell said her recollection from all the meetings, discussions and plans that we've seen have included the widening of Nashua St. The original plans were just for the east side and then Eric Schelberg brought up widening the west entrance. Without going back through the minutes prior to November, it is the recollection of this Board that the widening was part of this plan.

B. Westgate stated that he was not at the initial meetings but has always operated on the understanding that the depiction of the strip along the front of St. Joseph's property along Nashua St was to engineer but not have to construct it. The rationale being that offsite improvements are a result of modifications to a site or development of a new site are only an imposition on the developer or the property owner if the improvement causes the need for the offsite improvements, the rational nexus analysis. I think the Board has always understood the traffic impact is anticipated to essentially be neutral and maybe it was not made clear enough that there was a distinction between the designing of the road widening versus the actual road construction. That was implicit to us, since we're not causing the need and not causing the imposition from traffic generation to increase that load and therefor that need. P. Amato said there has been a difference of opinion, when you go back to the Selectmen's minutes and the yes response. B. Westgate said he thought the turning lane concept was something within the existing pavement width as opposed to the need for widening and also a component of the reconfiguration of the driveway entrances. It's also worth noting that St Joseph's is providing the design, will be doing the contemplated sidewalk work and redoing the entrance and roadway system for Kaley Park as well as for itself. Those are all contributions being provided by this project even though it's not increasing the traffic load in a

material sense that require the offsite improvement. J. Langdell said we may have a difference of opinion on that as well, given the numbers and what we were told regarding the decreased patient use of the ER and now that it's changed over to an Urgent Care center. You have space that you aren't going to be using and creating more space and presumably have more practitioners and I can't imagine that your patient volume for visits isn't going to increase. Also, and it is only my observation, there can be a backup if you try to make a left turn into the facility during the day now, so there is a problem currently for clients and staff going in and out and this is not due to Kaley Park.

S. Duncanson said there would be added traffic for the gym and rehab facility. D. Santos clarified that there would not be a pool in the new facility but the gym area is essentially equal in size to the existing area on the lower level behind the medical center. The capacity of the community room is around 30 people and that is a program function that they currently have. J. Langdell said there is a difference between using it "not frequently" and touting a new community center room and presumably doing more outreach that will bring more use. P. Amato said he can't believe they would make this big an investment if it wasn't going to attract more people than what they have now. That's absurd and I would think somebody has done studies to show it will be successful. This is a substantial investment and it will drive significantly more traffic than what is there now, so to say there will be no difference in traffic just doesn't seem to make sense. S. Duncanson said even without traffic difference, we still have a problem today with the traffic using the existing facility. They are going to add more space, more programs and more people which will create more traffic problems than already exist today. P. Amato said if St Joseph's isn't willing to pay the costs to make Nashua St appropriate, and they are willing to take us to court on that, then we can stop now and let that go through the wind first. S. Duncanson agreed.

B. Demers referenced the community room in the Hudson Medical Center and said it is utilized quite a bit from PT events to education series. The current facility does not have a very good community center but the new building will be nicer and we would be more open to inviting the public for education sessions. Going back to the Selectmen's meeting, we were discussing land swaps. I was agreeing to the access road to Kaley Park; the reference was not to Nashua St. I know we've talked about making some adjustments in the event that Nashua St was widened but by no means did I say we would take care of that. K. Bauer said Chairman Daniels really was concerned with several things but one was the widening of Nashua St. Has there been a recent traffic count done on Nashua St? It is a very busy road. J. Levandowski said she would get that information to the Board. J. Langdell said there should be quick turnaround as that data is listed on the NRPC website. K. Bauer reiterated that obviously, putting this amount of money into this project, one would assume the business plan would include growth. Milford will grow and this is on the busiest street in Milford. J. Langdell said while Milford may or may not see growth, we are updating a well-known medical center that services many surrounding towns. K. Bauer explained that the DPW director's primary concern was the effect of traffic for this complex for all the reason's we've said, now and in the future. It was assumed from past meetings and from previous plans that the road widening was to be part of this project. P. Amato said here we have another area where there are differing opinions. It's things like this that make me want look at every little detail so that we are very clear about what we are doing. He then asked the applicants if they are clear with where the Board stands on this. K. Burchard replied yes, very clear. S. Duncanson added that seven of us thought one way and the applicant thought differently.

B. Westgate asked for a brief recess. Upon reconvening he said they were not in the position to come to a judgment about the Nashua St widening tonight. It is a cost factor that has to be analyzed internally and we are unprepared to make that commitment. We respectfully request that the determination of the question pertaining to the Nashua St widening be tabled to the next meeting. J. Langdell acknowledged the request and suggested continuing discussion on the land exchange and the streetscape.

K. Burchard reviewed sheet X-1 that showed the different elevations laid out from west to east. A stone wall and railing will embellish the top of a gravity versa-lock retaining wall to make up some of the grade differences. We wanted to show the intent behind those screening elements. The nearly vertical retaining wall will be 6ft above the parking lot grade in some areas and will be on the back side of the fence to preserve the appearance of the railing as you look from Nashua St. It will have tie-back anchors and the stacked stone wall would need to be mortared. There would also be a small concrete slab for the wall to sit on. S. Robinson inquired about the versa-lock material. K. Burchard said a semiticious fake stone. S. Duncanson said it looks very nice, it is split face and will not be uniform. K. Burchard said the wall height ranges from about 6' on the west end to 4' on the east end.

There is not enough width to build the berm and there are limitations as to how steep the grade can be made. He then went over the grade and drainage for each of the stations at 25' intervals and noted that he will add elevation notations on the plan. The elevations range from 252' to 254' for Nashua St and the MRI area will be even with the first floor elevation at 248.9', which is lower than Nashua St. Nashua St is a very old roadway that defies standard definition. It is a non-standard super elevated roadway through the curve, but AASHTO standards are used for the proposed widening of Nashua St. The entrances as proposed, ultimately match up with that widening.

K. Burchard referenced sheet SX-2 and explained the proposed grading and landscaping along the streetscape. S. Duncanson inquired about the sidewalk on SB 6-7. K. Burchard clarified the symbols shown were for an ADA ramp and the 1/12 slope at the landing connection where the bumps are. J. Langdell referenced sheet SP-6 and inquired about the crosswalk and ramp by Linden St. K. Burchard said the sidewalk along Nashua St dies at Linden St and the entrances are designed so that the ultimate widening can come through without touching the ramps or the crosswalk because that essentially forms the proposed curb line of the widened Nashua St. If the sidewalk were moved back now there would be drainage problems due to the slope from a widened Nashua St.

P. Amato referenced SP-6 and inquired about the property line and asked if the berm is only on St Joseph's property. K. Burchard said that is correct. S. Duncanson asked why the proposed sidewalk was asphalt instead of concrete. K. Burchard confirmed that the asphalt sidewalk is already there; what is shaded is proposed and the cross-hatching is what exists. P. Amato asked if the designing of Nashua St would give more flexibility to do the berm or would it come right up to the property line. K. Burchard replied that the proposed ROW line would be on the back side of that sidewalk; essentially the base of the curb would be 5' back. P. Amato asked what the distance of the property line to the edge of parking lot would be. K. Burchard replied that there is approximately a 10' berm area to the wall and the wall is at a 1:4 vertical. The elevations are referenced on SP-7.

S. Duncanson inquired about the snow storage on SP-6 and referenced the note stating that you cannot have snow storage under the power lines. How will you be able to prevent snowplows from doing that? J. Langdell said that would be an operational issue for St Joseph's. K. Burchard said that was a good point; they've had much discussion with PSNH but it is reality versus paper and we can put language in the contract for the snow plow company.

J. Langdell brought up Conservation Commission's comments regarding the bio retention cells in the rain gardens and snow storage areas. K. Burchard said he was not sure they fully understood what a focal point is and he used sheet D-4 to explain. They are locations where the water is collected and filtered through the filter media. NH DES accepts that for water quality treatment. Underneath the filter is an R-tank that holds the water and allows it to recharge so the goals that the Commission outlined really are achieved. They do allow ponding in the green spaces. They do have an overflow for a higher event storm. They do promote infiltration and they were adequate for bringing our volumetric discharge on the site to existing conditions. It's geared specifically to address the need for recharge and it also works very well with the Groundwater Overlay District. They are fairly shallow because we have to keep 4' above the seasonal high water table and there are four (4) spread around the site. P. Amato asked how they work when the ground is frozen. K. Burchard said these are below grade and there is no function if ground is frozen. If the ground is frozen, the rain runs off and goes through the filter media which doesn't freeze solid; it is a sandy mixture that sits on top of the geotextile filter fabric with an open drain chamber below. P. Amato asked if there were any places to view these in action. K. Burchard said he does not know how widely these are used but will provide some locations to the Board. In addition, there are gable pipes to help with the stormwater. K. Burchard referenced sheets E.1-3 and explained the separate sides of the roof drainage system. P. Amato said STR #1 was unclear. K. Burchard said it goes to the north of the existing medical office building and then reviewed the drainage for the entire site in detail.

J. Langdell inquired about the grass pavers. K. Burchard said the pavers for the fire lane are located at the southwest corner of the building. In speaking with Captain Smedick, he is not concerned about the slight grade and it is weighted for fire trucks. The sidewalk is beside it.

K. Burchard presented sheet SP-1 and explained that the land exchange would occur through a lot line adjustment plan, an equal land exchange between the Town and St Joseph's Hospital and a portion of dedicated land along Nashua St for the widening. All will be deeded and it will make for a single contiguous parcel of land for St



Joseph's. It will also make things simpler because the access easement that comes in, ties to Kaley Park. Today this easement allows people visiting the existing medical office to use this portion of the Town's land to get to that parking lot. Three parcels are affected by the lot line adjustment and parcels D & E would be involved in this equal land exchange, a geometric adjustment to the lot line. P. Amato inquired where the road in would be. K. Burchard showed the location and said there would have to be an easement on the Town's land to allow access into that entrance. P. Amato asked why would you do that, why wouldn't you just give the Town less land. K. Burchard said that the Selectmen requested an equal land exchange. There was a conceptual plan done that would achieve that, but it would require an adjustment of the parent tract. B. Westgate added that they didn't want to change the existing configuration of the core lot for St Joseph's because of the 2004 and 2013 ZBA variances. It is better to have mutual easements rather than a unilateral easement. K. Burchard said it also simplifies any future applications because it would only affect St. Joseph's, not multiple parties. PSNH will have a joint use agreement to allow access across their land easement. B. Westgate said we still need to finalize the process with the BOS. They seemed receptive but we have to submit formal application and hold public hearings. J. Langdell added that procedurally, you will need a statement or recommendation from the Planning Board and Conservation Commission after we've had a chance to review the proposal for the lot line adjustment. K. Burchard said that the new driveway entrance was on the Town's land but it would not be the Town's responsibility to maintain. He then further explained the easements. J. Langdell stated that all easement language will be sent to town counsel for review.

P. Amato asked Selectman Bauer if there was an advantage or benefit to the Town to have ownership all the way to Kaley Park as opposed to St Joseph's owning all of the land and just have an easement into the park. K. Bauer said she was not able to answer that. B. Westgate said that is a judgment for the Selectmen to make.

T. Sloan inquired if the land swap was related to the original acquisition of the land or if there any conservation easements pertaining to the land. A brief discussion on the amount of land being swapped followed. B. Westgate said we can have discussion with the Selectmen about whether they own any of the frontage where the driveway entrance is and maybe this Board's recommendation would pick up on that thought, perhaps. J. Langdell suggested that Jodie do some research relative to any specific deed restrictions or conservation easements.

There was a brief discussion as to whether to begin discussion on the waivers or not and it was decided that due to the late hour, it would be best to do that at the next meeting.

Chairperson Langdell listed the Planning Board's requests, as discussed tonight:

- A rendering showing the view from Linden St
- Samples of the proposed materials
- A 3-D model, if possible
- Trip generations

J. Levandowski asked how realistic it was to have the architect provide a 3-D model. P. Amato said they need to try to convince this Board that this is an appropriate building for this site, so they need to do whatever they feel they need to do to accomplish that, because right now I'm just not sure. S. Duncanson concurred. K. Bauer said a model may not be practical but it would show the scale and reiterated her concerns with a contemporary larger building.

P. Amato made a motion to table the application to the 2/18/14 meeting. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30pm.